

Hon'ble Minister and the Hon'ble Member can be settled in the former's chamber with which I have nothing to do. If it is not in public interest, I will not press the Government to place the papers on the Table of the House. If it is for any other reason, I will have to press the Government to place the papers on the Table.

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—Actually this relates to the proceedings of the Government in regard to the confirmation of three Deputy Inspectors-General. The Hon'ble Member's point is that one of them had been appointed as Inspector-General without having been confirmed as D.I.G. As I said earlier, the answer to that part of the question is 'YES'—that it is a fact that one D. I. G. was appointed to officiate as Inspector-General without having been confirmed in his post as D.I.G. In regard to that there is absolutely no objection to place the proceedings of Government on the Table of the House or to give any supplementary information that the Hon'ble Member wants.

**Sri B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.**—You have said in your answer that Sri Thimmaraj Urs was confirmed in January 1952. Was it not communicated to him?

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—That is the date on which confirmation takes effect. His confirmation takes effect from 4th January 1952.

**Sri B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.**—Is it not that the order is subsequent to this or after this?

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—I do not know what is meant by 'this'

**Sri B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.**—You have said that he has been promoted in the year 1952. I want to know whether he is not aware of this confirmation. Is it not the practice in Government that when a promotion is given to an officer, the Government will communicate his confirmation to a certain branch? Is it not in vogue?

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—Sir, actually the question relates to the confirmation of Sri Thimmaraj Urs who took charge as Inspector-General on 9th June 1955. The date of confirmation, that is, the date on which the confirmation takes effect, is the 4th January 1952. But

the Government Order making that confirmation was actually made on 20th April 1956. That is, the confirmation was with retrospective effect from 4th January 1952.

**Sri B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.**—Is it right in the opinion of the Government to communicate orders like this?

**Mr. SPEAKER.**—It has been given retrospective effect.

### Nationalisation of Bus Transport in the State.

**Q.—255. Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL (Brahmavar).**

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the number of Districts in the State wherein Bus Transport had been nationalised;

(b) whether there is any proposal before the Government to nationalise the Bus Transport in the whole State to augment the Revenue of the State; if not why?

**A.—Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home Affairs).**—

(a) and (b) Bus Transport had been partly nationalised in some of the districts of the State. The policy of the Government is to nationalise Passenger Bus Transport Services by stages in keeping with the policy laid down by the Planning Commission. Phased programme is being prepared. It is also proposed to establish a Road Transport Corporation.

**Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.**—Sir, in clause (a) of my question I have asked for "the number of districts in the State wherein bus transport had been nationalised", but the answer to that is not quite clear. Will Government be pleased to state the number of districts in the whole State of Mysore wherein bus transport has been nationalised?

**Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—Although the question seeks information in regard to the number of districts wherein road transport has been nationalised, information has been given in a much more informative manner, if I may say so, because it would not have added to the

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

information that the Hon'ble Member already had, if the information had been furnished districtwise.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He wants to know the number of districts and not district-wise information. He does not want the names of the districts.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Actually, the position is that except in two or three districts the road transport routes have been nationalised; not wholly but partially. They have been wholly monopolised on some routes.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—It is stated that the "policy of the Government is to nationalise passenger bus transport services by stages". May I know from Government how many months or years or decades it will take to implement this plan?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I do not apprehend that it will take more than a year or two to have complete monopoly of road transport services in the new State of Mysore.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In some of the districts of the former Bombay State, road transport services have been fully nationalised.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Even in respect of the districts of the old Bombay State that are now part of the Mysore State, certain routes have still to be monopolised.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Very few of them.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—There are still a few of them to be monopolised.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎ. ಪಾಟೀಲ್.—ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲ ನ್ಯಾಷನಲೈಸ್ ಆಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲ ಫಾಯದೆಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅಥವಾ ಲಾಕ್ವಾನಾಗಿದೆಯೋ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a different question altogether. The question is only about nationalisation. The question of income does not arise at all.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—What is meant by the sentence 'Phased programme is being prepared'? Can we have further particulars in regard to that?

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—Phased programme really means that we have to cut our coat according to our cloth. Hence the extent of increase in the monopoly will depend upon how much money we can put into the purchase of

buses for running these services on the routes.

### Retirement of Teachers under Private Management in violation of Government Order.

Q.—36. Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore City South).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it has come to their notice that teachers in certain Educational institutions under private management are being made to retire against the Government Order No. 10905-6—Edn. 80-54-4, dated 1st November 1954, passed under Mysore Educational Grant-in-aid Code;

(b) whether representations have been made by teachers of such institutions;

(c) the age-limit fixed under the Code to teachers of such institutions;

(d) whether the private institutions obtain prior sanction of Government in the matter of retirement of teachers;

(e) whether the Director of Public Instruction made any recommendation in the matter;

(f) the action they have taken in the matter?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Education).—

(a) No.

(b) Does not arise in view of the answer to (a).

(c) No definite age limit is fixed under the existing Code.

(d) No.

(e) Yes.

(f) Orders were passed that the *status quo* may continue.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Has it come to the notice of Government that, in spite of the Government Order, some private institutions are arbitrarily retiring their teachers?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—The answer is very clear. The answer is 'No'. There is no Government Order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no Government Orders prohibiting